



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Life and Letters of the First Earl of Durham: 1792-1840. By STUART J. REID. Two Volumes. (New York and London: Longmans, Green and Company. 1906. Pp. xix, 409; xi, 409.)

English political biography for the nineteenth century is gradually becoming complete. Full and authentic biographies—biographies based on letters and family papers—are still wanting among more modern statesmen in the case of Bright, Beaconsfield and Salisbury. An authentic biography of Bright is unfortunately not yet in sight; but both the Beaconsfield and the Salisbury biographies are in preparation. At the time work was begun on the Salisbury biography there were still wanting biographies of three men who had played a great part in English political life in the first half of last century. Taking these in the order of their importance, or rather in the order of what they accomplished for political progress in Great Britain, they were Durham, Grey and Graham. All these men were of the administration which carried the great reform bill of 1832. Grey was premier in that historic cabinet; while Durham and Graham were of the committee of four by which the reform bill was drafted for submission to the cabinet, before it was introduced by Russell to the House of Commons.

Of these three men none has lost more in fame by the long delay attending the publication of his life and letters than the Earl of Durham. He was the greatest liberal of the nineteenth century. He did more for the advancement of liberalism in England and in Canada than any man who preceded him in the house of lords or any peer who up to the present time has followed him in the advocacy of liberal principles. He stood by liberalism as distinct from whiggism in its darkest days in England. Between 1813 and 1835 he was the only man among the peers who advocated parliamentary reform; reform in the Church of England; the removal of disabilities due to religious opinions; reform in the civil service; and the establishment of a national system of education. He advocated all these reforms in parliament and on the platform in the constituencies without any concern as to how these reforms, and in particular the reform in the system of parliamentary representation, would affect the fortunes of the whig oligarchy, which, when liberal principles were once more in the ascendancy after the political downfall of Wellington in 1829, conceived that by reason of the services of the whigs between the revolution of 1688 and the beginning of the reign of George III, it had

a mortgage on the government of Great Britain, and could, without heed to popular opinion or popular endorsement of its action, divide the spoils of office among the small and exclusive group of which the old whig aristocracy was composed. Durham never asked how the reforms he so boldly championed—all of which have long ago been accomplished—would affect what his contemporaries who were of the whig oligarchy described as “their order.” Class interests and privileges, mostly usurpations of popular rights, never appealed to him as they did to his whig colleagues of the Grey administration. He asked himself in all these matters what was due to the people of England; and publicly declared that he would never cease to agitate so long as an ascertained popular grievance went unredressed.

For fifty years there was not a more obvious gap in English political biography than that due to the non-appearance of a full and authentic life of Durham. Just what Durham accomplished in connection with the reform bill while he was of the Grey cabinet; how he stood out for a reform bill which should really reform the rotten and nondescript system of election to the house of commons and restore political power to the middle and working classes; and to what extent he put backbone into Grey—all this was not known until Mr. Stuart Reid's *Life and Letters of Lord Durham* was published. And moreover until this biography appeared credit had been given to everybody but Durham for the epoch-making report on Canada. Even in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, Charles Buller is credited with the authorship; although in his lifetime Buller was careful to make it known that it was the work of his chief. Buller never disguised the fact that it was the work of the man who at a great sacrifice to himself, sacrifice of personal comfort, exile from home, and postponement of political ambitions—went out to Canada in 1838 to make an end of the turmoil that was then so seriously endangering not only the peace and advancement of upper and lower Canada, but jeopardizing the imperial connection.

Biographies of Grey and Graham, as has been said, are still lacking but Grey can be judged to a very great extent from his letters to King William IV, and from his remarkable correspondence with Princess Lieven; and more material for forming a judgment of Grey is forthcoming in Mr. Reid's *Life of Durham*. An estimate of Graham, who was never in the first class of English statesmen, can be formed from the life of him that was written in the early sixties by McCulloch Torrens. Before Mr. Reid's biography appeared it was possible

to estimate Durham from his speeches, and from his famous report on the political problems which upper and lower Canada presented to British statesmen in 1837 and 1838. Durham's speeches could be read in the newspaper files and in the *Hansards*. But none but the closest students of political history ever turn to the *Hansards*, or brave the dust on newspaper files fifty or sixty years old; and until the war in South Africa even Durham's famous report on Canada was much more frequently alluded to than it was read; and it had practically passed out of the public mind until it was reprinted three or four years ago.

Thus it comes about that Mr. Reid's *Life and Letters of Durham* does much more for the reformer of 1832 and the high commissioner to Canada of 1838 than is usually done for a long departed statesman by a detailed and authentic record of his life. Mr. Reid's two volumes do much more than merely fill up an obvious gap in British political biography. They form a monument almost as abiding as that on Penshaw Hill, Durham, to a man of the English landed aristocracy who in the early days of liberalism was a liberal without whig or any other qualification, from the time he entered the house of commons in 1813; and who stood as loyally by his liberalism when he was high commissioner at Quebec, as he did in the house of commons or after 1829 in the house of lords. Elevation to a peerage usually subdues the liberalism of most men. It puts a greater distance between them and the common people. New peers—even men of liberal principles—soon come to think and speak of "their order," and to regard themselves as of a class apart. Men with whom they have worked in politics when they were of the house of commons come to be regarded as agitators even if they are but continuing movements for reform with which the peers were associated in their plebeian days; and like Melbourne, who was Durham's colleague in the Grey administration, and who treated him so cavalierly in the Canadian crisis of 1838, they are disposed to ask, "Why can't you leave things alone?"

No such change came over Durham after 1829 when he was elevated to a peerage and transferred his parliamentary activities from the house of commons to the house of lords. His line in the house of lords and at great public meetings in the constituencies of the North of England was the same as it had been when he was of the house of commons, and was dependent on the votes of the freeholders of the county of Durham for his seat in parliament. He did not agree with

Grey, his father-in-law, nor with Melbourne, Russell and Palmerston, that in reform concession to the popular demand had gone as far as it must go after the whig oligarchy had conceded the act of 1832. The reform act never satisfied Durham. He wanted a parliamentary franchise as wide as exists today in Great Britain. It was his aim to bring every man within the constitution, and to give him his part in its working. It has required two more reform acts—those of 1867 and 1884–85, each preceded by long agitation—to realize what Durham regarded as due to the people of England in 1832 and the immediately succeeding years. Moreover, in 1832, Durham urged that election by ballot should be included in the reform act; as Lord John Russell urged that part of the cost of parliamentary elections should be lifted from the shoulders of parliamentary candidates and defrayed out of the public purse. Both proposals were deemed premature. The whigs were opposed to making an end to open voting because they feared that the great whig landed proprietors might lose their control over the small boroughs that were continued as parliamentary entities after 1832, and might also lose the territorial political influence that they exercised in the constituencies.

Durham could not carry the Grey cabinet with him either for a wider franchise than the ten pound householder qualification in boroughs or for the ballot. Eleven out of the thirteen members of Grey's cabinet were peers or held courtesy titles as peers. All those men, Durham alone excepted, were of the whig oligarchy; and in the cabinet the narrow and exclusive whig ideas of popular political rights—ideas as to what it was safe for the whig oligarchy to concede with due regard to the safety of "their order" easily triumphed; and the whigs conceded only such a measure of reform as would save appearances for men like Grey and Russell who had been identified with the reform movement in the days when the whigs were in opposition and the tories were supreme. Only such a measure was conceded as would least endanger the control which the whig magnates exercised over parliamentary representation in the smaller boroughs and in the counties. Russell could not persuade the whigs to travel even as far as he was willing to go. Durham could induce them to go but a short distance in his direction. Russell accepted the reform act and after 1832 insisted that it was a final measure, and that it was useless for the radicals in and out of parliament to agitate for more. Durham, on the other hand, went into the constituencies and urged the need of further reform. He strongly believed in the ulti-

mate triumph of democracy. He believed in it and worked for it; for he held and was always ready to assert that the people of England sooner or later would gain all the political rights that should be theirs; and he had no narrow conception of what these rights should be.

It was a great loss for the cause of political progress when Durham went for two years as ambassador to St. Petersburg. His death in 1840, so soon after his return from his Canadian mission, was a loss that was never fully replaced so far as the house of lords was concerned; for never since Durham's day has there been a liberal peer who was so heartily and sincerely in sympathy with great popular causes or who was so whole-heartedly trusted by the rank and file of the liberal party throughout the country.

The value of the biography lies chiefly in the wealth of new material that was available for Mr. Reid—in the letters which have been embodied in the book, rather than in the frame work which the biographer has constructed. The framework is conventional but is generally good for Durham's career in England. For his work in Canada the setting is less satisfactory; and the workmanship of the biography cannot be said to have been much influenced by the examples which Mr. Reid had before him in the biographies of Gladstone and Granville.

EDWARD PORRITT.

Citizenship of the United States, Expatriation and Protection Abroad.
(House of Representatives, Document No. 326, Fifty-ninth Congress, Second Session. Washington. 1906. Pp. 538.)

A joint resolution passed the senate of the United States in April, 1906, providing for a commission to examine into the subjects of citizenship, expatriation and protection with instructions to make recommendations to congress, but in the house the committee on foreign affairs rejected the plan and suggested instead a board of expert diplomatists to be appointed by the secretary of state. The result was the creation in July of the same year of such a board composed of Mr. James B. Scott, solicitor for the state department, Mr. David J. Hill, minister to Netherlands, and Mr. Gaillard Hunt, chief of the passport bureau. The method adopted, at once economical and scientific, and so far superior to the more common method of congressional commissions, was highly to the credit of the house com-